DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 072 778 JC 730 048

AUTHOR	Kintzer, Frederick C., Ed.
TITLE	Workshop for New Community Junior College Presidents and Their Wives.
INSTITUTION	California Univ., Los Angeles. Graduate School of Education
PUB DATE	Jul 72
NOTE	53p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Office of the UCLA Community College Leadership Program, University of California, Los Angeles, California (limited number of copies available; no price quoted)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Educators; *College Administration; *Community Colleges; Junior Colleges; Leadership Training; Post Secondary Education; *Presidents; Professional Continuing Education; Speeches; Summer Workshops
IDENTIFIERS	*California

ABSTRACT

The activities of and papers presented at the annual Summer Workshop for New Community Junior College Presidents and their wives, held at UCLA, July 9-14, 1972, are provided in this report. The papers and their authors are as follows: "Toward Efficiency in Community College Instruction" by B. Lamar Johnson, "The Human Relations Process" by William J. Crockett, "Administrative Organization and Leadership in the Community Junior College" by R. Dudley Boyce, "Administrative Biases on Making Democratic Administration Work" by John W. Dunn, "Communication" by Edward Simonsen, "Administrate: A Simulation Game for New College Presidents" by Eileen P. Kuhns. "Some Horizons for Leaders" by Norman C. Harris, and "Community College Presidents" by James L. Wattenbarger. A list of the names of the workshop staff and of the workshop participants is provided. (DB)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 072778

WORKSHOP FOR NEW COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS AND THEIR WIVES

Frederick C. Kintzer

— Editor —

JC 130 048

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

July 1972

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAR 23 1973

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

CONTENTS

PART ONE

Page

SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP ACTIVITIES

Sessions for Presidents 3

Sessions for Presidents' Wives 5

PART TWO

PAPERS PRESENTED

Toward Efficiency in Community College Instruction 7

The Human Relations Process 13

Administrative Organization and Leadership in the Community Junior College 15

Administrative Biases on Making Democratic Administration Work 21

Communication 25

Administrate: A Simulation Game for New College Presidents . . . 29

Some Horizons for Leaders 35

Community College Presidents 45

PREFACE

The annual Summer Workshop for New Community Junior College Presidents and their wives was held at UCLA, July 9-14, 1972. Topics that generated major discussion are presented in this report, along with an account of a simulation game that occupied a full day. While the publication was prepared primarily for participants and staff, a limited number of copies are available from the Office of the UCLA Community College Leadership Program.

The 1972 Workshop was financed entirely by participant fees. Presidents and their wives, and the Directors stayed together in Rieber Hall on the UCLA campus for the entire week, thereby maximizing opportunities for informal conversation and discussion. Frederick C. Kintzer and Ruth Kintzer were Co-Directors of the Workshop. Assisting them were Dennis R.W. Wing and Marjorie Wing, and R. Dudley Boyce and Mary Boyce.

THE WORKSHOP STAFF CONSISTED OF:

Marilyn M. Bates, Assistant Professor of Education, California State University, Fullerton, California.

Harriet Breitbart, Party Manager, Fox and Hounds Restaurant, Santa Monica, California.

William J. Crockett, Vice-President, Human Relations, SAGA Administration Corporation, Menlo Park, California.

John W. Dunn, Superintendent, Foothill Community College District, California.

Norman C. Harris, Professor of Higher Education, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Eileen Kuhns, Vice-President, Mount Vernon College, Washington, D.C.

Jane E. Matson, Professor of Education, California State University at Los Angeles, California.

Edward Simonsen, Superintendent, Kern Community College District, California.

Harold Vander Sluis, Floral Expert, Santa Monica, California.

James L. Wattenbarger, Director, Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.

Attending specialists participated informally in the scheduled sessions and many of them met with participants for conversations during free periods scattered through the week. This group included:

Florence B. Brawer, Assistant Research Educationist, UCLA.

Arthur M. Cohen, Associate Professor of Higher Education, UCLA.

Lawrence W. Erickson, Assistant Dean, School of Education, UCLA.

Claude W. Fawcett, Professor of Educational Administration, UCLA.

Arthur M. Jensen, President, San Bernardino Valley College, California.

B. Lamar Johnson, Professor of Higher Education, UCLA.

Leslie Koltai, Chancellor, Metropolitan Junior College District, Kansas City, Missouri.*

---

* As of December, 1972, Mr. Koltai is Chancellor of the Los Angeles Community College District.

Erick L. Lindman, Professor of Educational Administration, UCLA.

Ray E. Loehr, President, Ventura College, California.

John Lombardi, President Emeritus, Los Angeles City College, California.

C. Robert Pace, Professor of Higher Education, UCLA.

Special recognition is due the Workshop staff and attending specialists who gave generously of their time and energies.

Frederick C. Kintzer, Director

PART ONE

SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP ACTIVITIES

Sessions for Presidents

An informal exchange between participants at the Annual Summer Workshop provided opportunities to discuss problems of individual concern. Structured meetings enabled the presidents to hear major and timely topics discussed by the Workshop staff.

B. Lamar Johnson, speaking at the opening banquet, described a study of efficient instructional systems. He followed the literal meaning of efficiency as a measure of results compared with expenditure of time, energy, and money. These instructional systems, studied by Arthur Berchin, offer examples to be adopted or adapted by other colleges.

William J. Crockett conducted sessions devoted to experiences in human relations. He stressed the importance of impressions--good and bad--we make on others. He demonstrated the value of understanding our intellectual and emotional attitudes before gauging either the effect that we have on others or that they have on us.

R. Dudley Boyce defined administration as a concept of social interaction wherein a structure is developed that accomplishes the institution's purpose and protects the integrity of all persons involved in both the formulation and execution of its policies. The administrative structure must be clear, but never inflexible.

John W. Dunn outlined a council system representing faculty, classified personnel, and students, whereby they can express their views to the administration and, if necessary or important, to the board of trustees. At the same time, it winnows out the obvious or the frivolous and sends along to the board only valid suggestions.

Edward Simonsen spoke of the art of communication as a special part of human relations. He mentioned the various publics who must be informed, the tools and techniques to use, and illustrations (including warnings) of how to apply them.

Eileen P. Kuhns described a simulation game that illustrates the compromises necessary at various levels of management among conservative, moderate, and liberal viewpoints, and between personal and institutional gains.

Norman C. Harris pointed out the hazards of the many current people-oriented curriculums, for whose graduates there is currently no demand. "Higher education for the present . . . must indeed be . . . a preparation for life's work, not a means of getting out of work for life."

James L. Wattenbarger discussed the basic principles of junior college philosophy and function. He spoke from many years' experience with Florida's successful organization.

SESSIONS FOR PRESIDENTS' WIVES

Women participants of the Workshop met with the presidents at the opening session to hear B. Lamar Johnson and again for the day-long session on human relations led by William Crockett. From then on, the women met independently with their own speakers.

Jane E. Matson presented an historical overview of the two-year college from its beginnings in the mid-1800s as a private institution to its present-day image with some 1100 colleges enrolling more than 2 million students.

With the availability of education and the many social pressures on young people to remain in school, the long-range growth of the community college is likely to continue. Ideally, the student population will reflect the community served by the college--one with a wide diversity of socio-economic levels, abilities and occupational interests. With this diversity comes the need for teaching methods that will provide for individual differences. Another need is great flexibility in campus climates and student services.

The future, she felt, will bring additional changes--more students, older students, more "in-and-out" students, and adjustments in time sequences (including weekends and a longer day).

Edward Simonson spoke on the role of the president's wife as viewed by a former president. He stressed the need for her to be a listener, a reactor, and a safety valve for her husband. She can help him professionally by calling to his attention magazine articles she reads, news items in the paper, programs on television, and anything else relating to his work.

A wife can be an asset or a liability. She can be a help to her husband in obtaining his job and a help to him in retaining it. She must like people, be tolerant, patient, and long-suffering. She should be flexible, good-natured, ready to move or ready to stay.

The president will often feel he has no time for a vacation. In that case, his wife should take the initiative and see that he does take one, even making reservations if necessary.

Marilyn Bates led the group through basic steps of transactional analysis, emphasizing the human need for spiritual nourishment. Behaviour patterns of various kinds were described. Participants were then called on to react to each other within the group.

Harold Vander Sluis, assisted by John Anderson, provided a wealth of information on flower arrangement. The necessary equipment was shown and described, and step-by-step procedures for producing effective arrangements were demonstrated as the two men deftly created ten lovely and unusual displays.

Harriet Breitbart provided recipes for a gourmet meal that would allow a hostess to be part of her own party. The meal could be fully prepared in advance. Decorative and work-saving pans that go from stove to table were displayed. Miss Breitbart made practical suggestions for group entertaining, stressing the importance of keeping things simple.

Staff members provided additional suggestions for entertaining large groups.

PART TWO

PAPERS PRESENTED

TOWARD EFFICIENCY IN COMMUNITY COLLEGE INSTRUCTION

B. Lamar Johnson

We are all aware that finance is one of the most crucial problems confronting the community college today--indeed it confronts all of American education. Taxpayers, legislators, and donors to education alike, are complaining about the costs of education. Bond and tax override elections are failing with alarming consistency; budgets are being slashed--concurrently with rising costs, caused by inflation and expanding enrollments.

Along with other units of American education, the community junior college is facing this financial crisis--and presidents are right in the middle of it.

No expert in finance, I hasten to disclaim the discovery of the solution to our financial problems, but I do want to discuss a plan that could make some contribution to fiscal economy and potentially aid in improving instruction.

In the fall of 1970, I visited a friend, Dr. Harold S. Sloan, an economist, a former university professor, and a long-time student of American higher education. He has a particular interest in the economics of higher education and in the cost and efficiency of instruction, fields in which he has made a number of studies.

During our visit, he remarked, "I am confident that today the colleges and universities of our nation are offering a good number of courses that are highly efficient. By that, I mean," he continued, "courses of which the costs are low and the learning outcomes high." He further suggested that the identification, description, and reporting of such courses could perform an important service during the current financial crisis in higher education. The findings of such a study could be disseminated, and the courses described could, with modifications appropriate to local conditions, be adopted by other colleges and universities.

Before describing a follow-up to Dr. Sloan's suggestion, however, I should like to ask for some information. I ask each of you to write on a sheet of paper the name of a course at your college that--keeping in mind its field of instruction--has a low (preferably a notably low) cost and high student learning. Please also write your name and the name and address of your college.

[Pause: Reporting of courses by members of the audience--including the identification of conventionally taught courses in the same or similar fields that might be paired with "efficient courses" taught at their colleges.]

A. League for Innovation in the Community College

In reporting a follow-up to my visit with Dr. Sloan, I shall first refer to the League for Innovation in the Community College, a national organization of 16 community college districts in eleven states. Since most members are multi-college districts, League colleges number 43. They are staffed by more than 12,000 faculty members and enroll more than 300,000 students. The purpose of the League is, through cooperative work, to carry out innovation and experimentation designed to improve various aspects of college operation. I am the part-time Executive Director of the League.

Thinking about my visit with Dr. Sloan and about the interests and program of the League, it occurred to me that the League might well make a survey of courses offered within its member colleges that were perceived as highly efficient in both costs and outcomes.

Following discussions with Dr. Sloan and with members of the Board of Directors of the League, it was decided, with his assistance, to make such a survey. Arthur Berchin was employed for a six-month period to conduct the study.

B. A Six-Month Exploratory Study

The first step was to invite presidents and deans of League colleges to identify highly productive courses offered at their colleges--keeping in mind both costs and student learning. To make paired comparisons, they were also asked to identify courses in the same or similar fields that were more conventional in nature.

Each college was then asked to supply cost data and any other available information about outcomes for each identified course (including both highly efficient and conventional courses) and descriptions of courses--their content, organization, and instructional procedures.

The third step in the study was Dr. Berchin's visit to each League district to make a mini-case study of each reported course. He secured more detailed data on the costs and the courses. Since the study was make in a six-month period, data on course outcomes were limited to those available at the colleges at the time of his visits. They typically included comparative grade distributions and comparative retention and drop-out data. Judgments of faculty members, students, and other observers were also sought.

The fourth step in the study was to report the findings. The report has been published by the League as Toward Increased Efficiency in Community Junior College Courses: An Exploratory Study.

The author states his purposes in these words:

> By surveying courses offered in community colleges of the League for Innovation in the Community College, the author hoped that examples of "highly productive" courses could be found; that is, courses that save their respective colleges some instructional costs and are at the same time effective in their

learning outcomes. By disseminating the results of the study, he further hoped that community colleges--and other units of American education--would be encouraged to replicate these "highly productive" courses or revise them to meet the needs of their students, keeping in mind the need to minimize educational costs and maximize learning effectiveness. Finally, by reporting these low-cost, high-learning courses, the League for Innovation hopes to make a notable contribution toward alleviating the financial crisis facing all of American education today.*

C. Limitations and Findings

As the Berchin book reports only a six-month exploratory study, it can in no sense be regarded as a controlled and definitive study. Its findings are by no means conclusive. The method--the design--of the study, however, can be commended to you; namely, identifying courses highly efficient in both costs and outcomes, as a basis for adapting them to other situations with appropriate modifications.

Please note that the courses that administrators perceive to be highly efficient are not consistently so. At times their costs are high, and at others their outcomes leave something to be desired. This finding in large part emerges from the short time available for the study. If a longer period had been available, empirical data might have been used to select courses for investigation.

A second limitation of the study is that findings are based on what actually happened in the courses studied. In other words, per-student costs were computed for the actual enrollment in each course for the semester during which it was studied. In many cases, courses have--without additional expenditures--a potential for teaching more students than were actually enrolled--thus reducing per-student costs. This possibility is not reflected in the report.

Against this background, I shall report five findings and make some suggestions.

1. The 56 courses described in the report are grouped under the following three methods of instruction: the large group mode, the individualized program mode, and the audiotutorial mode.

2. Comparing the three modes of instruction, courses using the large group mode are least costly per student, followed by those using the individualized programmed mode, and last by courses under the audiotutorial mode.

---

* Arthur Berchin. Toward Increased Efficiency in Community Junior College Courses: An Exploratory Study. Los Angeles: League for Innovation in the Community College. 1972. p. 2.

3. Courses taught by the audiotutorial mode are in general more costly than those taught by conventional methods, but should be noted that, since many audiotutorial courses have been organized for only a short time, their enrollments are far below their optimum level. If this optimum level of enrollment is achieved, audiotutorial costs would be significantly lower. (You will also note that the Berchin report does not include costs of space.) At Eastfield College, Dallas, for instance, one laboratory serves the needs of the whole audiotutorial course in biology, whereas six laboratories would be required if the course were taught by conventional methods. This saving of space represents an important economy.

4. Subjective data indicate that instruction in courses taught under one of the nonconventional modes is, in general, more effective than in conventionally taught courses. Instructors using the individualized programmed and audiotutorial plans report that they allow instruction to be highly individualized--permitting students, for example, to advance at their own pace. Those using the large group mode often compensate for impersonalization by using team teaching, by supplementing large groups with small-group instruction, and, on occasion, by holding discussions within large groups.

5. The use of paraprofessional assistants contributes to the effectiveness of instruction in all three nonconventional modes--but particularly in individualized programmed and in audiotutorial classes.

D. Recommendations

1. Dr. Berchin's major recommendation is: "All possible effort should be made to develop and implement highly productive courses."* He notes that such efforts, if they are to be successful, require ingenuity, creativity, and a great deal of time.

2. Develop plans under which interested faculty members can work on developing new plans of instruction. In this connection, a faculty fellowship plan--e.g., summer employment, released time, or both during the college year--can be useful.

3. Identify highly efficient courses in your college and/or in accessible neighboring colleges, study their characteristics, and determine to what extent they are relevant to other courses at your college.

4. Study the Berchin report to identify courses that might--at least in part--be adopted at your college and engage appropriate faculty members in planning possible adaptations of them to conditions at your college.

5. Finally, during this workshop, take occasion to exchange information and perceptions of highly efficient courses offered in your colleges, and exchange views and perceptions of some of the courses described in the Berchin report.

---

* Op. cit. p. 7.

E. Conclusion

In this presentation, I have attempted to develop a point of view on an important aspect of the financial crisis that today confronts the junior colleges of our nation. Since expenditures for instruction represent our largest costs, we must take steps to identify courses currently offered that are highly efficient in both costs and outcomes. We should also study their characteristics and seek to adapt them to other courses on our campuses. As an illustration, I have reported Arthur Berchin's exploratory study of efficiency in community college courses.

The community junior college is a teaching institution and will rise or fall according to the quality of its instruction, which you must take all possible steps to improve. Concurrently and consistently with this, you must pay special attention to cost factors in instruction, and examine and adopt plans and procedures that are highly efficient in both cost and student learning.

THE HUMAN RELATIONS PROCESS

William J. Crockett

We shall consider three basic assumptions (facts) about human relationships in our review of how to improve our own understanding of the process.

The first assumption is that first impressions are important. The first impression we make on others, whatever we are doing at the time, is positive or negative, or of no impact. Some of us are quick to form character impressions from such things as a limp handshake, a shifty eye, or long hair. In some cases, they tend to have important and long-lasting consequences for both people.

Scientific analysis, however, confirms that our first impressions of others are generally inaccurate, superficial, and inconsequential, even though they may linger for years and years. In most cases, our inferences simply do not hold up in fact.

Since people do form lasting impressions of us from our behavior (attitude, ideas, appearance), it is important for us to know what first impression we create and how we might modify our behavior to make for a better one.

The real problem is that we do not really know how we come across to others, and have little chance of ever finding out, for no one will risk telling us, unless we can make it safe for him to do so. Whether he tells us or not, we may be sure we are causing an impact on others.

The second assumption is that the basic element of human relations is our behavior, with which we make a positive or negative impact on other people. It is hard to know how our behavior actually affects others, but it seems to do so on two distinct levels; i.e., on their intellectual convictions and their emotions.

The things we say, the way we say them, the quality of our reasoning, the agility of our minds, the articulations of our thoughts, our judgments, fantasy, and humor all affect the intellect of another, and produce such intellectual reactions as conviction, agreement, affirmative judgments and decisions, and overt supportive actions--or the whole can be negative.

The things we say, the way we say them, our reasoning, our judgments, our prejudices, the way we handle differences, our attitude toward ourselves and others, our facial expressions, our hands, our habits, our voice modulation--all have an impact on the emotions of others. It can result in such reactions as anger, suspicion, frustration, jealousy, hatred, insecurity, fear, or their opposites. When negative emotions are created, they tend to pollute the intellectual situation, causing it to deteriorate further. The real bonding agent of human relationships is emotion; when it ends, so does the relationship.

Our proper objective, then, in this human relations concept, is to learn how to behave so effectively in our relationships that we avoid creating in

others negative intellectual judgments of us, and create instead those feelings that we really want (and need) for the long term, such as love, care, commitment, and sincerity.

The third human relations assumption is that we can improve our behavior and thus increase our own effectiveness if we so choose. We are not locked into what we are at this time, but can really effect significant change in ourselves and thus change the impression (impact) we make on others. First we must re-form our connections with our own emotions so that we can be aware of them at any time. When we are unaware of them as feelings, we also are unaware of how they are, or may be, influencing our behavior. We must re-establish our communication link with these great sensors of ours--our emotions.

The second thing is to become aware of how much of our behavior is the result of our emotional input and how much of it comes from our intellect. We can be sure that, when our negative emotions are active in our system (hate, jealousy, envy, greed, anger, self-pity, frustration, etc.), our behavior will be bad (ineffective), and we must really make a major effort to keep our behavior intellectually oriented. Not an easy task!

Once we have become aware of these powerful forces within us and understand how they affect our behavior--generally for the worse--we can start changing our behavior patterns.*

CONCLUSIONS

Some of the conclusions we can reach about human relations are self-evident from the foregoing. They are:

Our behavior is the basis of our human relationships (good and bad).

Feelings (emotions) are the gauges for measuring the quality of these relationships.

Our feelings result from the impact of others' behavior on us.

To be effective in our human relationships, we must cultivate an awareness of our own feelings, of how they motivate our behavior, and of the impact of our behavior on others.

Our behavior is our responsibility--we can change and control it if we want to do so.

Our feelings are important, powerful motivators of our behavior.

---

* Another way to speed this personal awareness and awakening is through the use of such organizational development techniques as team building, etc.

ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION AND LEADERSHIP IN THE COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGE

(A Concept of Social Interaction)

R. Dudley Boyce

In the decades that lie ahead, as in the past, institutions of higher education may be expected to advance and disseminate knowledge, but unique to the challenge of this era is the acceleration in the substantive work to be done and the increasing number of opportunity seekers. A commitment to learning throughout one's youth and adult life "is now a requirement of everyone who would not be a mere slave to the society he serves." No longer can either limited or informal processes of learning enable one to change his thought and action in response to changes occurring around him. Not only is change too rapid, it is too forbidding, too pervasive to permit an adequate adjustment by untutored trial and error.*

Tomorrow will place unprecedented demands on higher education for adaptability, creativity, and innovation and will require administrators to make systematic efforts to enlist all members of the enterprise in collaborative undertakings.

Colleges as Centers of Inquiry

The primary job of the educator is to facilitate learning--to provide instruction in the various skills and subjects deemed crucial for the young. We cannot afford to consider our community and junior colleges simply as centers for dispensing cultural orientations, information, and knowledge developed by other social units. The complexities of teaching and learning have become so formidable and the intellectual demands on the system so enormous that the college must be much more than a place of instruction. It must also be a center of inquiry.

A college organized as a center of inquiry is characterized by a penetrating search for meaning and rationality in its work. Fundamentally, such a center requires that teachers be free to inquire into the nature of what and how they are teaching. As every teacher knows, educational strategies cannot be meaningfully separated from content, and he must have continuing opportunity to test such strategies in context.

Educational planning must be equal to the task of eliminating inflexibility and tradition-bound practices. It must deal with established notions about the clientele to be served by higher education, the size and character of institutions, and the nature of the teaching-learning processes. These challenging questions presume that a working consensus will be reached among all members of the enterprise on what purposes their institutions are to serve.

---

* Faulkner, D. "Principles of College Executive Action: The Responsibilities of the College President," Journal of Higher Education, 30:266-275, May 1959.

The complexities of this kind of endeavor raise questions about whether the organizational forms and practices current in educational structure can meet the demands made of them. Throughout this period of growth in American higher education, most institutions have made a conscious effort to preserve traditional forms of organization, but there is substantial evidence that tradition has not served adequately. Indeed, the growth of the community college movement in the past three decades contributes to the evidence that higher education must and will change. Even more important than change in the character of institutions is the importance of ordering new processes of education itself.

A Social Concept of Administration

School administration is defined as a process concerned with creating, stimulating, maintaining, and unifying all the energies making up an educational endeavor to realize institutional objectives. This definition distinguishes between the process and its dynamism. As process, it is an intervening force that synchronizes and integrates often contradictory social energies to produce unity of purpose and effort.

The college may be regarded as a social system and, as such, it functions in relation to goals and objectives meaningful to its members. Its effectiveness will likely reflect the clarity with which its mission is defined. Furthermore, a system of values will provide order against internal conflict, and defense of institutional integrity against external demands.

The college may also be regarded as an institution and, as such, it is a formal structure within which the social system functions. Roles are assigned by the social system and find their relationship in structure. Expectations of performance, standards of conduct, and systems of operation are institutional determinants giving order and integrity to social functions.

Roles are filled by individuals who bring to the institution personality characteristics, needs, personal desires, and wishes that determine behavior. The playing of roles (the social phenomenon) according to standards and expectations (the institutional phenomenon) should establish patterns of behavior consistent with defined goals. The various roles assigned to two-year colleges have been reasonably set forth by society, but the realization of the expectations depends, in large measure, on the leadership exerted, not only by formally appointed administrators, but by all members of the profession. To this end, formal organization exists.

Authority, Organization, and Responsibility

Ultimate authority rests with institutional purposes and objectives. The formal organization of an enterprise brings order to the processes through which appropriate human and material resources are enabled to accomplish the purposes of the enterprise. Objectives of the college are achieved through systematic efforts of group interaction. This is assured where interaction is based on laws and regulations governing the educational effort, and where principles of administration are applied. A symbolic authority is embodied in those who find their roles in the formal organization.

It is apparent that any enterprise, however small and for whatever purpose, must have a clearly defined hierarchy in which authority is personified and responsibility is determined. Set standards of conduct give order to the hierarchy; success is measured by standards; and standards are fixed by values.

Functional aspects of the formal organization can best be defined in levels of responsibility. The definition of institutional purpose, as applied either to two-year colleges of the private sector or to comprehensive community colleges, is a prime responsibility of the governing board. The board of trustees, too, is the bridge between the college and the community--or its constituent interests, however they may be defined. It is the board that must translate the constituents' interests into educational policy.

Policy decisions on educational programs follow within this frame--be they curricular or co-curricular. Direct concern of the board focuses on acquisition of financial resources as well as actions to acquire, maintain, and protect human and material resources necessary to the continuing life of the college. Decisions on these matters often have legal implications, and responsibility is determined accordingly.

To these ends, the single most important function of the controlling board is the selection and appointment of the chief executive officer, the college president. In him is vested the executive, or leadership, role. Through him are determined the character and tone of the educational endeavor and the efficiency and effectiveness of the effort.

It seems clear that the broader aspects of the chief executive's job are something much deeper than the mere direction of an enterprise. More likely he is concerned with activities involving encouragement of group decision-making among people of potentially divergent interests. Continually, he must be abreast of circumstances that give rise to change in purpose of those both within and without educational circles. His is the concern for communications that lead effectively to positive corporation thinking. As the leader of educational expression and endeavor, he assumes responsibility for the establishment of well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and many ways of getting the job done. In more complicated processes, involving varying interests and activities, specialization of work is necessary. With this comes the need for planning and coordination, as well as for direction.

In all administration, the fundamental task is the organization of the efforts of people. As cooperation does not come automatically, but develops in organization (and under leadership that seeks it), success in "human engineering" is vital to the administrative role. Not only must the leader epitomize dedication to democratic faith and processes, he must exemplify it in behavior. His consideration for his fellows, subordinates, and charges must reflect friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth. Since he will be appraised on these skills, it is essential that he understand thoroughly these principles and their implications in action.

Functional Concepts of Administration

Though the governing board will continue to judge the success of the educational enterprise by evaluating this leadership, it must not assume the function directly. A board will deprive itself of its administrative authority once it penetrates the realm of executive authority. Symbolic authorities identified as "administrator" and as "executor" have different countenances. Each is a highly individualized personification of the institutional purpose and objectives, and their separate identities are important to an institution's strength--indeed, to its survival.

The college's administrative structure reflects its educational purposes. If the institution purports to offer a comprehensive spectrum in its curriculum, all segments are entitled to equal attention and direction. Assignment of responsibility for the development and implementation of common elements deserves equal executive attention and equal status in structure. This will assure equal access to the resources of the institution as they are distributed. If, for instance, services provided by student personnel offices or educational programs of a technical nature are subordinated to, say, community services or college-transfer programs, the chances of these segments achieving their potential are limited.

Moreover, administration is improved where emphasis is placed more directly on the educational and personnel functions and less directly on supporting services. The central functions of the institution deserve direct alignment with defined authority; supporting functions do not. Neither business nor community service functions, for instance, are central to the basic educational aims of the enterprise and, as such, they should not enjoy a direct line to authority.

Within the context of the formal organization, a considerable measure of flexibility is necessary to assure communication. Success depends as much on the cooperation among interrelated coordinates of structure as it does on hierarchical implementation. Undoubtedly, prime functions of the college are nurtured when the academic dean works in concert with the dean of student affairs. Again, the service functions of learning are strengthened by relating closely the work of the librarian to the learning experiences directed by teachers. If interactions among these coordinates were limited only to expression through line communications, students would be deprived of easy access to them. Certainly, it is through these relationships that a direct impact on student learning is most likely achieved.

Administrative Behavior

The sense of freedom and flexibility apparent in structure is expressed in the behavior of those who possess the symbolic authority of the college. Administrative behavior is important in effective organizations of all kinds. It probably is, or should be, the crucial energizing force in all cooperative efforts. If this is true, it is essential that those who administer, and their associates, gain an appreciation not only of the processes through which administration can serve effectively the needs of organization, but also of the concerns of the people who comprise it.

One critical test of administrative behavior is the development of an organizational structure that will both accomplish the purpose of the enterprise and protect the integrity of the people involved. An organization must facilitate sound decisions, delegate and allocate authority and responsibility, and achieve coordination among tasks. It must assure quality performances that can weather the test of evaluation according to predetermined objectives. Of no less importance, however, is the organization's responsibility to promote individual and group understanding and acceptance of common goals. It must encourage creative planning and facilitate free and effective communications that stimulate and energize people to whom tasks are assigned. As the personal integrity, satisfaction, and growth of its members must be fostered, administrative roleplaying must be both effective and affective.

Triadic Administration--A Concept of Social Interaction

It is an accepted principle of democracy that people concerned and affected by plans and decisions should be free to participate, to the extent possible, in formulating them. The process of planning may prove to be as important as the plan that evolves. Through participation, staff members achieve not only a better understanding and acceptance of the program development, but also individual growth in competence. Solutions to problems are likely to be better because various competencies and differing viewpoints are brought to bear on them. The creative potential of the group is utilized. Loyalty and morale are strengthened. The effectiveness of how plans are carried out and interpreted to others should be enhanced.

Where organizational behavior protects these ends, judicious use is made of advisory committees, administrative cabinets, curriculum and guidance councils, and other means of cooperative group activity for the entire faculty. Special interest groups, independent of the formal structure, are recognized and their freedom to review and recommend policy is encouraged. The delegation of responsibility in a broad spectrum is fostered. Institutional dependence on special skills within the rank and file membership is accepted, and the contribution of special talent is given full status and recognition. All of this facilitates that flow of communication and that expression of ideas so important to the viability and strength of the college.

This triadic concept of administrative behavior assumes an interrelation of roles within structure. It assures access to the processes of governance by all the constituent interests of the college community. It thrives on flattening the hierarchical structure and shortening the lines of communication. The concept recognizes discrete areas of authority and responsibility, and respects the need for specialization. It vests functions of decision and planning in councils committed to specific purposes.

Above all, an expression of faith in individual worth and integrity, the concept supports the premise that access to governance in the affairs of the institution will nurture responsible behavior among all who are committed to its purposes.

ADMINISTRATIVE BIASES ON MAKING DEMOCRATIC ADMINISTRATION WORK

John W. Dunn

I am pleased to be invited to present some of my biases to a group of new presidents and new administrators in the junior college movement, for I have been chief administrator of the Foothill Community College District for just a year; this makes me "new" as well. In my twenty-odd years in California community college work, I have held four administrative positions--four years as dean, nine as superintendent of a single college district, seven as chancellor of a multi-college district, and one as superintendent of a multi-college district. I mention these positions and call myself a new administrator because of the basic truth that one cannot transfer an administrative structure from one institution to another. I have come to the conclusion that all that one can do in moving from position to position is to bring one's attitudes, sensitivities, and experience in working with people to the new situation. The administrative structure of any institution, rightly or wrongly, is partly a product of the people available to fill the positions, for we all know that any system, any structure, will work if the right people are on the staff.

To begin our discussion of this question of administrative structure and its democratic potential, let us look at a typical organization chart for a community college. It is headed by a president, superintendent, or chancellor--whatever the title--responsible to an elected board of trustees. Its second line of administration is composed of deans--two, three, or even four--responsible directly to the president. Each dean, depending on the size of the institution may have assistant deans. The Dean of Instruction may have an Assistant Dean for Vocational Education, an Assistant Dean for Continuing Education, and perhaps under the new evaluation legislation, a need for an Assistant Dean or an Associate Dean for Faculty Evaluation. The Dean of Students, on the other hand, usually has a Registrar, an Assistant for Student Activities and Student Government, and sometimes a Director of Guidance, all reporting to him. The third dean may be called Dean of Administration or Business Manager, but he handles the business functions of the college. He in turn will have an organization of assistants--one for buildings and grounds, one for finance, et al. Beneath this dean and assistant-dean level comes a group of division chairmen and, in some institutions, below the division chairmen are a number of department heads. Finally, far down on the chart, the faculty--and somewhere beneath them, the students. Any administration, working and communicating via this structure alone will have trouble, even though this structure, or one similar to it, is necessary. No organization can operate efficiently without a fixing of responsibility. The necessity of delegation of authority and responsibility calls for a structure with adequate job descriptions to make that responsibility fixed and functioning. But consider the plight of a faculty member, a student, or a classified staff member in this hierarchy who has a burning need to communicate an idea through the channels to the chief administrative officer, the board of trustees, or both. It is a long, hard road to the top. There is probably no administrator in this room who has not felt the conflict (the dichotomy, actually) that exists between the open-door philosophy of his office and the need not to bypass an administrator responsible for the very thing the individual coming through his

open door wants to discuss. Everyone has had the experience of talking to an assistant dean and wondering if he is setting up a situation where the dean is rendered ineffective because the assistant dean has found he can go directly to the president with the question. We want to avoid such bypass situations in the face-to-face relationship.

The point is that, if we deal with a responsibility-designating structure, we create tremendous difficulty in involving the various elements of the college community in the decision-making process. My first personal bias, however, is that such involvement not only is the result of rising demand by segments of the college community, but also is highly valuable to the administration and to the board.

The solution to this question is at least simple to set up. The direct path to the board, to the administration from any part of the college community, must be through a representative council, cabinet, or whatever. It is a deliberating body, composed of representatives of the college community, and its agenda is made up of items coming from any one or all of the segments represented in the group. There are few colleges without such a representative group. Throughout the nation, there have been recent attempts by boards of trustees and administrators to involve (to a rather high degree) students, faculty, and classified staff members along with the administration in the governance of the district. In some districts, this involvement takes place at board level; representatives of faculty senates, classified employee groups, and students sit on the board. In some cases, these positions have been legalized and represent bona fide participating voting memberships. In most cases, they are a gesture by the board to get input from the various segments of the college community into board decisions. Granted that most districts are making such efforts in one way or another, are there guiding principles that can make such an involvement system work effectively? I shall attempt to identify some principles of effective use of such a system in getting input into the decision-making processes from those who are affected by the results.

Bias No. 1: Involvement of staff and students should occur at a level below that of the board of trustees. It is desirable to keep the board of trustees' meetings from becoming forums, from becoming arenas for differences of opinion that must be arbitrated by the board, since they have enough of this kind of activity coming directly from the community. At the same time, the board needs to be assured that significant recommendations coming to them represent the various affected members of the college community. An administrative council or cabinet provides that assurance.

Bias No. 2: A complete job description of the council, details of its functions, definition of its areas of concern are necessary if the council is to work properly. For example, it should be clearly spelled out that the superintendent or president does not intend to use the council as the scapegoat to avoid his responsibility for making sound recommendations to the board. Administrators can sometimes go as long as two years without making a major decision simply by using the process of turning everything over to a committee, but such is not the purpose of a council of this kind. Hence, the council members must realize that they function as an advisory body to assist the administration in developing sound policies based on the greatest good for the greatest

number. At no point must the council view itself as a decision-making group. Accordingly, in the structure that I have worked with, the superintendent or president chairs the council without an actual vote on issues coming before it. Inasmuch as the council is developing recommendations to him and to the board, he should not participate in voting on them. The best councils, however, offer a true consensus through reaching obvious conclusions based on the same data studied by each member.

Bias No. 3: Membership on the council should be determined by the body being represented. The faculty should select their representatives, the students theirs, etc. Serving by administrative invitation provides the possibility of a stacked group--or at least the suspicion of it.

Bias No. 4: A formal agenda and complete minutes of all council meetings should be maintained. Such minutes should then be widely distributed among the representative groups within the college community and to the board. The board than knows how much discussion and study has gone into the recommendation before their consideration of it. At the same time, the faculty, students, and staff organizations can judge the kind of representation they have at this policy-developing level.

Bias No. 5: Provision should be made for a minority report to the board of trustees. It is obvious that issues are going to be discussed at the council level without producing consensus. A guarantee should be made that, if necessary, any point of view that differs from the recommendation of the group gets a full hearing at the board level. This is not usual, but should be guaranteed to any representatives on the council. Occasionally the minority point of view is the administrative one and, although these differences should be ironed out if possible in the council arena, the board must occasionally hear two points of view on the same issue.

Bias No. 6: Every effort should be made in conducting council meetings and the business of the district to avoid any power approach on the part of representatives of various segments. The council should not become an arena for a power struggle, and the members need to be reminded frequently that, by our joint study and effort, we are attempting to develop the best recommendations as they affect the most important segment on the campus--students. The council that functions by jockeying for position, by excessive use of parliamentary procedure to block the opposition, cannot last. Its success is based on a democratic involvement, not on a struggle of adversaries.

In conclusion: First, if you do not really think such processes will improve your judgment in developing recommendations, do not use them. Tokenism does not work in this area. In other words, if you do not want advice, do not ask for it.

Second, be flexible and recognize that joint study on issues is going to influence your own conclusions.

Third, avoid the easy practice of substituting the group perception for your own. It is a good practice occasionally to push through a recommendation to the board that the council may not endorse. It keeps you honest and helps the council define its role better. Such a recommendation, of course, must be soundly documented, not capricious.

COMMUNICATION

Edward Simonsen

I. INTRODUCTION

I am envious of all of you as you begin your careers as presidents. What a challenge! You are assuming a title and a role with meanings to everyone that are quite different from dean, department chairman, coordinator, or any other title we use in higher education.

This fact came to me very vividly about five years ago. After having been a college president for about ten years, I was named by the board of trustees of our district to be the new superintendent. When I called home to break the news to my wife, she was not at home. One of my teen-age daughters answered the phone and inquired why I was calling. When I told her I had been offered a new job, she pressed further. I said the position was that of Superintendent of the Kern Community College District. "You're not going to take it, are you?" she asked. When I replied apologetically that I was thinking of it, she said, "Oh, Dad, there goes our prestige!" And how right she was! Presidents have a lot more status than superintendents. My only hope now is to become a chancellor--although I am not too sure of that title. Wasn't Adolph Hitler a chancellor?

You are fortunate to be presidents, but it was not always so. In the '60s, during the period when college presidencies were going begging and students were having difficulty being admitted to college, Art Buckwald wrote about the outstanding high school senior who had been turned down for admission by a number of prestigious schools. He finally received a most cordial response from one of the colleges, explaining that it couldn't accept him as a freshman, but would be happy to offer him the presidency of the college. He replied that he and his parents had carefully reviewed the offer and greatly appreciated the nice things said about his apparent promise as a leader and academician, and about his youth and energy. In fact, he was too smart to become a college president!

The situation is different today. Many people are again aspiring to the college presidency, and I know that you have been chosen only after a rigorous screening--which you survived. I congraduate you!

During this workshop, others will speak on facets of leadership, to which you have already had an excellent introduction by William Crockett. Since I have reviewed much of the material he presented to you and developed with you, I realize that, although his subject was "Human Relations," there is some overlap. Communication is basic to human relations.

My approach will not be at all academic or profound, but rather pragmatic. I shall deal with the various groups with whom you communicate and with the tools, and give some suggestions, and a little of "This I Believe."

II. BODY

A. The Various Publics

As a college president you will face a varying number of publics. How effective you are in communicating with them will, to a great extent, determine how effective you will be as president.

The primary groups with whom you will work are faculty and staff, students, governing board, community, news media, governmental agencies (state, local, and federal), and alumni. While your contacts will be both internal and external--and all of them are important--the faculty and staff, along with the governing board, should be foremost. While all the groups have subgroups, the faculty and staff are probably the most varied. Included in this group are the various departments, the department chairmen, the academic senate, the faculty association, the administrators, the student personnel workers, and the librarians. Each group has its own concerns and cannot be treated like any other.

B. The Tools

To communicate effectively, you must know which tools are available and which are effective for you. In this appraisal, each of us develops his own administrative style. What works well for one president might be a disaster for another. Some of the failures that have occurred can be traced to accepting wholesale--to the point of stupidity--the most successful modus operandi of a president whom one admires. Each person must develop his unique style, but must not work too aggressively at it, because, if it is artificial, it will not be convincing or effective. Some years ago, when Arthur Godfrey fired the singer Julius La Rosa because he allegedly had lost his humility, some sage of that time said, "Humility is the human quality that you lose as soon as you know you have it." So it is with administrative style. In a nutshell, capitalize on those procedures you find effective, but don't be afraid to abandon those with which you are not comfortable or completely honest. As an example, it is dangerous for a president whose academic background is in one field to quote widely from another field where his knowledge is shallow, rusty, or shaky.

The tools that are generally available are:

1. the spoken word. It can take many forms: (a) appearances before groups of all types, (b) major speeches, (c) talks, (d) announcements, (e) introductions, (f) greetings, (g) serving as a master of ceremonies, (h) being on a panel, (i) serving on a committee, (j) reacting to a confrontation, (k) appearing on radio or television. While this list is not complete, it suggests that each speaking opportunity is different and requires a different approach.

2. the written word. The range here is from a memorandum to a major article--or even a book. As professionals, we want to show our ability as writers. This is fine, but don't hesitate to have someone else read it--even edit it!

C. Examples

Here are a few suggestions I have found useful.

Making speeches does not lend itself to any set procedure. It is wise to be ready to hold forth for anywhere from five to forty minutes. At a banquet or other gathering, where you haven't been specifically invited to address the group, be on the safe side--be ready to say at least a few well-chosen words. The odds are that you will be called on even if you were not alerted. If you know you are going to give a talk or a speech, find out all you can about the group--who will be there, how many will attend, how many others will address the body. If you're planning to tell a joke, try to find out if it has already been told by someone else. Also be sensitive about the rest of the program. Few speakers have been criticized for closing their comments before their welcome was worn out, but listeners often wonder why a speaker did not stop after reaching one of the climaxes of his speech ten or fifteen minutes before its eventual close.

To show that I practice what I preach, I'd like to bring this to a close, leaving time for an exchange on the overall subject of communication; but first let me give you a few suggestions.

D. This I Believe

1. Remember that listening is as important as anything one can say.

2. Use memos intelligently and with great caution.

3. Make person-to-person contact for touchy situations. It is usually preferable to other means of communication.

4. Respond to written inquiries promptly.

5. Return all telephone calls.

6. Treat adversaries with respect, but don't be a pushover.

7. Stay cool, even if everyone else is beginning to lose his cool.

8. If at all possible, have someone with you when you must meet a hostile, militant, or pushy group. You may need help.

9. Do not undercut your subordinates by taking over.

10. Do not run scared!

11. Use follow-up memos of understandings and agreements.

12. Do not be afraid to say thank you.

13. Be specific and clear about who, where, when, and how.

14. In addressing boards of all types and groups, do not sell an idea and then buy it back. In other words, be sensitive to how much information the group wants.

15. Do not stew over your defeats or gloat over your victories. You're bound to win a few and lose a few.

III. CONCLUSION

In short, communications are delicate. Develop a style, be courteous, be aware of the situation you are involved in. Have the courage of your convictions, but do not be so impressed with them that you let them stand in the way of the correct solution.

Effective communication cannot be accomplished by the president alone. He must enlist the assistance of his colleagues and subordinates. This requires him to have an overall communication plan for his college and to be sure that everyone understands his role in that plan. He must keep the channels open and communicate!

ADMINISTRATE: A SIMULATION GAME FOR NEW COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

Eileen P. Kuhns

Like many other Americans, college presidents may have cut their competitive teeth on a simulation game that has become a household word: Monopoly. According to a recent column by Nicholas von Hoffman in the Washington Post, some 40 million Monopoly sets have been sold by Parker Brothers since the game was invented in 1933 by an unemployed heating engineer. Sets are still being manufactured at the rate of 20,000 per day. Thus millions of Americans have had an opportunity to simulate wheeling and dealing in real estate without risking their own capital or reputation.

Beyond the luck of the dice, the skill of the individual Monopoly player may contribute to his winning and may thwart the success of other players, but the very design of this simulation game precludes any cooperative effort to achieve larger objectives, for example, an increase in the gross product of Atlantic City, the home of the Boardwalk and other Monopoly properties.

In contrast, the simulation game of Administrate focuses sharply on the interactive dependence of all members of a fictional administrative team. The newly appointed college presidents playing the game at UCLA in summer 1972 had to give priority to institutional rather than personal objectives. No personal objective could be achieved without the cooperation of another administrator, who by game design was never a kindred soul.

The game of Administrate was developed for the American Association of Junior Colleges in 1970 by Abt Associates. According to their manual, the game was designed to encourage players to:

1. work primarily toward the goals of the institution, even when they differ from the individual's own goals

2. work toward personal goals without opposing the progress of the institution toward its goals

3. understand and describe the parochial behavior of other administrators as constructive and proper advocacy of the interests of his constituency, rather than merely obstructionist or perverse

4. generate alternative solutions as a step toward the resolution of problems involving conflicting interests

5. exploit available data to support proposed solutions.*

*Abt Associates, A Workshop in Administrative Skills for Junior and Community College Administrators. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Abt Associates Inc., 1970, p. IV-3.

These objectives form the basis not only for the scoring system, but also for the post-game debriefing. Although it is a "play without a script," there is nothing random about the roles to be played. Each role illustrates the dynamics of interactive dependence in the achievement of both institutional and personal goals.

As part of the 1972 leadership conference, the group of some 20 newly appointed two-year college presidents was divided into three administrative councils with seven or eight members each.

All three councils included a president, a dean of students, a dean of academic instruction, a president of the faculty senate, a president of the student government association, a dean of vocational instruction, and a director of business affairs.

Each player began with a one-page scenario, his own role profile, the college catalog, and a copy of the local board resolution on which action was to be taken. Those players taking the role of president had a sheaf of financial data, which they later distributed. The dean of students, the dean of academic instruction, and the president of the faculty senate each had copies of his respective proposals, which they planned to submit in response to the above-mentioned board resolution.

The player presidents were given a council agenda to further set the stage for the administrative meeting that was to be the game setting. Each player introduced himself in his simulated role to enhance his role identification.

The role profile of each player included his "hidden agenda," namely, the personal favor he was trying to win from a player of another "political persuasion" in the campus power structure. For example, the conservative president of the faculty senate had to win his personal favor from the moderate dean of academic instruction. The progressive dean of students depended for his favor on this same conservative president of the faculty senate.

The need to compromise his stand on the institutional objective was an ever-present threat to the individual seeking a personal favor under such circumstances.

The institutional objective under consideration was described by the following resolution from the college board of trustees:

> A. Be it resolved, pursuant to a unanimous vote of the Board, that Colfax Community College shall take all necessary steps within twelve months to enable the College to increase substantially the percentage of students who successfully complete the courses and programs in which they enroll and consequently to reduce the rates of attrition and failure. Furthermore, the College must improve its performance with respect to students from low-income families, both by attracting more such students and by facilitating their successful completion of College programs.

The Board believes that achievement of these goals will require the establishment of a new system of evaluating and rewarding faculty members based in part upon student performance.

B. The Board officially requests that the President submit for its consideration an implementation plan for this reorientation of Colfax Community College, such plan to have been approved by the Colfax Community College Administrative Council prior to its submission.

C. The President shall acknowledge in writing to the Local Board Chairman receipt of a duly executed copy of this resolution.*

Three proposals were submitted by council members of conservative, moderate, and progressive inclination, respectively. Abt Associates summarizes these proposals as follows. (At the conclusion of each proposal is the associated cost estimate.)

Conservative Plan. Submitted by president of the faculty senate. Raise admissions requirements so that students unable to succeed will not be admitted. Bolster remedial programs by 20% increase in staffing. Cost: $20,000.

Moderate Plan. Submitted by dean of academic instruction. Reduce class size by 25% (from 28 to 21), by increasing faculty size. Increase remedial programs by 50% increase in staffing. Cost: $100,000.

Progressive Plan. Submitted by dean of students. Increase recruitment efforts in scope and type, including three full-time outreach workers. Add two more counselors. Evaluate all personnel in terms of their students' performance, measured through tests, placement, success in jobs, etc. Cost: $115,000.**

As background information for the council meeting, the player president discussed a recent editorial in the local Colfax Crier. This commentary highlighted the attrition rate, especially in the vocational and technical programs, the need to attract more low-income students, and the specter of a private firm that would like a contract with the board to educate the Colfax students "and be rewarded entirely on the basis of the performance of the students."

The principal agenda item for the council meeting was fashioning a response to the board resolution. Nevertheless, if some players were thought to be less

---

*Abt Associates, op cit., p. IV-16.

**Ibid., p. IV-25.

than involved with their role, the game leader could use one of the "crisis cards" designed for specific role positions. For example:

> Five students have been arrested on charges of possession of marijuana. Certain students are upset that the administration allowed the "bust" to take place on college property and have complained to the dean of students that the arrest constituted a breach of "academic freedom." Meanwhile, angry parents of many students have been calling and writing to the school. The newspapers have asked for a statement; the American Legion, which was holding a meeting when the news first broke, immediately passed a resolution calling for the president's resignation. Discussion of the issue in the legislature is feared.*

This "hot potato" could become the crisis of the dean of students or the dean of academic affairs, or, as a next choice (according to game rules), a problem for the president of the student government.

While some such crises did require the attention of the council, it was preoccupied with finding a solution to the problem the board itself had posed. Meanwhile, each player was courting the approbation of another player--without his knowledge--in the hope that his personal favor would be granted at the conclusion of the council meeting.

The president was committed to carrying out the directives of his board and knew that his reappointment depended on his success in doing so. At the same time, he realized that continuing implementation of institutional objectives would depend on the cooperation of his entire administrative team, some of whom were much too conservative to favor the current resolution from the board. He had one "political plum" to dispense: the office of executive vice president, a vacancy he was free to fill as he saw fit.

Each player could win a maximum of 100 points from a combination of (1) carrying out his role in support of one of the proposals submitted in answer to the board resolution, and (2) gaining his personal favor, i.e., his "hidden agenda."

The scoring system was cleverly arranged to show the interaction of the various roles, particularly as they illustrated conservative, moderate, or progressive viewpoints, e.g., as the board resolution itself represented a progressive point of view, it was easy for the progressive dean of students to make a sincere effort to implement that institutional objective. If he were successful, he could be awarded 30 points, but his success in working toward the institutional objective could diminish his chances of obtaining his personal favor from the conservative president of the faculty senate. If he failed in this latter mission, he would lose 70 points. Until the council meeting was over, only the person who was about to ask the favor knew about his "hidden agenda."

At the conclusion of the council meeting, each player answered two yes/no questions about every other player and decided whether he would grant the

favor that one other player had asked of him. From the results of these yes/no answers, the game leader and assistants quickly prepared a master score card for the entire council.

When there are enough players to constitute more than one administrative council group, the competition may shift from intra-team to inter-team. Such was the case in the summer of 1972, when three teams participated, with total scores varying enough to provide some lively discussion.

Following the scoring, the board met to hear the president present the plan of his council, which the board could accept or reject after brief questioning. They also decided on the retention of the president. Both of these board actions were reflected in the score the player president himself earned; this in turn contributed to his team's score. The board could be an opposing team or the game leaders, as in this instance.

The debriefing or post-game discussion is an important part of the learning process of the simulation game. As suggested by Abt Associates, players discussed such things as the conflict of institutional and personal objectives, the importance of developing clear institutional objectives, why some personal favors were withheld, why conservative players may seem obstructionist when they are only carrying out their unit objectives in a way that ultimately contributes to the institutional objectives, the importance of making an alternative proposal when an impasse is reached, and the facilitating function of sound information in solving administrative problems.

In the debriefing for this particular game of Administrate the participants ranged rather widely, touching on Maslow's need hierarchy, McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y, and a bit of management by objectives (MBO).

In a recent publication, Bender and Richardson cite a definition of management from the American Management Association:

> Management is guiding human and physical resources into dynamic organization units that attain their objectives to the satisfaction of those served (students and society) and with a high degree of morale and sense of attainment on the part of those rendering the service (faculty, staff, administrators).*

This definition of management is a distillation of theories from authors such as Drucker, Maslow, and McGregor. Although many of their insights pertained to business organization and management, it is increasingly clear that they also describe the academic scene. Every aspect of the Administrate game is designed to illustrate a particular interaction pattern in an educational setting.

---

* Louis W. Bender and Richard C. Richardson, Jr., Management Concepts and Higher Education Administration. Tallahassee, Florida: Center for State and Regional Leadership, 1972, p. 20. (Parenthetical words are their adaptation for educational institutions.)

To serve as a learning resource, simulation games must be both relevant and realistic. They are more easily developed if theoretical structures already exist to provide a logic for the objectives of the game and for its scoring system. In part, the game of Administrate owes its success to the rich background presented by management theory.

Collective bargaining, intra-faculty governance and decision making, accreditation, management by objectives, accountability, and local and state level coordination and control are a few areas where simulation has been or could be used if adequate games were developed.

In each of these areas, staff members need the opportunity to explore without risk in a telescoped time frame. Simulation games like Administrate provide such an experience and, when evaluated critically, can be a resource for future action.

SOME HORIZONS FOR LEADERS

Norman C. Harris

Introduction

Past is not always prologue, but futurists have a habit of quoting historians. Economists extrapolate future trends from past data, meteorologists study old weather records, and educators are fond of talking about the needs of the '70s according to what we did in the '60s or the '50s. It is recorded that Isaac Newton, the great physicist and natural philosopher of the seventeenth century, when praised for his "clear view of the mysteries of science and the problems of mankind," replied, "If indeed I have had a clearer view it is only because I have stood on the shoulders of the giants who came before me."

Before looking to some far horizons, then, it is fitting to look back along the path we have come and to look around to see where we are now.

Our Legacy from the 1960s

A selected few of the trends and developments within the community junior college movement during the 1960s (and up to 1972) are important for new presidents as they think about their role of leadership for the future.

1. Growth. The single most striking characteristic of the '60s was growth. Unbridled, unchecked, uncontrolled growth--from 600-odd institutions and three-quarters of a million students to nearly 1200 institutions and 2.5 million students in twelve years. During three or four of those years, the rate of growth was equivalent to opening the doors of a new junior college somewhere in the United States every Monday morning.

Currently, of course, growth has slowed. The growth-rate curve, though still in an upward trend, has fallen off to a gentle slope. Today's growth is steady, but no longer explosive. A major problem may be adjusting to stability from an administrative style predicated on growth.

2. Occupational Education. The decade of the 1960s was the era when technical-vocational education--education and training for middle-manpower development--finally became an accepted and important function of the community college. In some colleges, and indeed in some state systems of community colleges, career programs (as distinguished from college-parallel and general education programs) enrolled 50 percent or more of all students.

Disappointingly, this encouraging trend seemed to reach a peak about 1970, and the past two years have seen students rejecting economically and industrially related programs and turning instead to general studies programs, liberal arts and humanistic studies programs, and so-called "awareness" programs. The youth culture of today, stridently condemning materialism while basking comfortably in its amenities, rejects "working with things" and wants to "work with people." Economic affluence is held in contempt, productivity is considered somehow "grubby," and competition is evil. Learning about a problem

is equated with its solution, and learning a little bit about a lot of things ("expanding one's awareness") is preferred to the rigorous, skull-cracking perseverance required to become a paraprofessional, a technician, or a craftsman.

We must not blame youth alone for these ideas, because they got them from some of the so-called educational statesmen of the 1960s. I well remember attending the California Junior College Association Spring Conference at Santa Barbara in 1965, where W. H. Ferry, then Associate Director of the Center for Democratic Institutions, inveighed against junior college technical-vocational education as follows:

> Meeting this statutory obligation (i.e., providing vocational-technical education) is delaying the proper development of the most exciting of experiments...in higher education. It is a distracting, time-consuming, and irrelevant obligation.... You have far more important concerns than readying young men and women for the job market.

A rousing chorus from liberal arts faculty members attending the convention greeted this declaration.

3. Open-Door Admissions. There was much talk about the open-door college in the 1960s, and each year saw the philosophy gain in acceptance. Today, in most states, the open-door college has become a reality, and access to a community college is now possible in almost every part of the United States.

Here, too, the voices of "non-think" have been leading us down the primrose path. Suddenly the idea of the open-door college has been translated to mean open-door curriculums and even open-door courses. The assumption is that every student has a "right" to enroll in any program or courses he desires, regardless of his academic aptitude, background, or experience. Almost at the threshold of acceptance in some colleges is the philosophy that success (i.e., nonfailure) in the program or course is also the student's "right," no matter how dismal his performance. If he doesn't make it, it's not his fault, but yours.

4. Faculty Power and Student Power. The decade saw a full swing of the pendulum on governance and decision-making. In 1960, it could truly be said for most community colleges that:

a. The board established policy and represented the lay public.

b. The president and his administrative teams administered policy (indeed they made policy much of the time) and managed the institution.

c. The faculty taught.

d. The students studied.

Now, twelve years later, the following description is disturbingly close to the truth in many colleges:

a. The board attempts to set policy, but is hamstrung by a clutch of constraints including restrictive legislation, "demands" of pressure groups, collective bargaining contracts, due process limitations, faculty intransigence, student unrest, and demands for increased services of all kinds of an era of taxpayer revolt.

b. Faculty still teach (about half as much as they used to at twice the salary), but they also demand, disrupt, and strike. "Faculty power" is today the major influence on governance in many community colleges.

c. Students still learn, but performance standards are eroding. More students learn a little about a lot of things, but my impression is that fewer students are learning a great deal, in depth, in career-related fields. Students sit on committees, vote on policy matters, and influence the governance of institutions, but these "rights" are ordinarily not accompanied by any willingness to assume a commensurate responsibility. Frankly, I agree wholeheartedly with the board member who rebuked the student who made all the demands, when no responsibility was to be assumed.

d. Administrators are trapped in an almost untenable position between the board and other citizen groups on the one hand, and the faculty and students on the other. One faculty-student caucus at a Midwestern community college recently defined the role of administration as "keeping the rooms clean, lighted, and heated, and getting paychecks and student aid checks out on time." However, recent evidence shows that students are beginning to regard the faculty as the enemy, and to ease off on the president.

5. Accountability and Cost-Benefit Analysis. A decade ago higher education held the public trust almost without dissent. Legislators, businessmen, industrialists, taxpayers, voters, and other citizens generally supported the contention that college was good for all who desired to attend, that "universal higher education" was a legitimate goal, and that affluent America need not even be concerned about the cost. From that zenith of public confidence, we are now near its nadir. Not only is every budget item suspiciously scrutinized, every program questioned, and management subjected to local- and state-level harassment, but--and this is most significant--the very thesis of "college for everybody" is now seriously questioned. Citizens are demanding accountability--what are they getting for their money? Many Americans are unconvinced that higher education has improved either the economy or the quality of life; some, indeed, are beginning to look on higher education, not as contributing to the solution of America's problems, but as being a part of the problem. Because of this lack of confidence, they are refusing to bankroll it any more.

6. Curriculum Proliferation. If the course of study at the typical community college of 1960 could, by some stretch of the imagination, be labelled with that delightfully sadistic term, "the saber-toothed curriculum," that at many of today's comprehensive community colleges could aptly be dubbed "the mealy-mouthed curriculum." We have gone in some twelve years from a too-rigid offering that did not allow for either the diversity of society's needs or the diversity of student interest to the opposite extreme, where curriculums and courses proliferate like weeds in a spring garden, seemingly limited only by the imagination and special interests of faculty and students. Problems either initiated or exacerbated by the "mealy-mouthed curriculum" include:

a. low enrollments and small class size

b. high unit costs

c. programs and degrees of questionable rigor and currency, leading neither to a job nor to successful transfer to a four-year college

d. programs and services, which, though they may be needed by society, are not the business of an educational institution

e. as a result of (c), the imminent danger that, like the high school diploma, the associate degree will soon become meaningless in a degree-surfeited society.

So much for the look backward, devoting possibly too much time to where we are and how we got here. My remarks have been somewhat negative in tone, perhaps even truculent, emphasizing problems rather than triumphs, but that is the way it is in this business. If one cannot endure an excess of problems over triumphs, his career as a president will be short indeed. As for issues for the '70s, I have no intention of telling anyone how he ought to lead, or even in what direction he should lead, since no one can be prescient in these matters. I merely suggest some things to think about as he begins his tenure as president. He must not get so involved in acting and reacting that he can not set aside time to think. Each man has premises on which he bases his actions, and they may well differ markedly from others. The important thing is that no premise be left unexamined.

The Road Ahead to 1980

The scouts returning from up ahead bring a mixed bag of tidings. "There's good news and there's bad news" is the current idiom.

Two items of good news are:

1. Well-qualified faculty will be relatively easy to find throughout the decade in almost all disciplines and specialties. Although a market that leaves well-qualified people unemployed is not a happy situation, it nevertheless promises that teachers who do have jobs may exert a somewhat more dedicated effort than has been their pattern in recent years. Salary demands may slack off a little in accordance with supply-demand factors and resource limitations.

Especially planned community college teacher education programs, like those operating at UCLA and at Michigan, are increasing in number. Programs under the Education Professions Development Act, featuring master's level subject-matter preparation plus a one-semester internship in a community college, are currently turning out hundreds of well-qualified faculty members each year. The new degree, Doctor of Arts in Teaching, is being pioneered at a few universities, including Michigan, and by 1975 the flow of people with this preparation should be appreciable. There are also hundreds, if not thousands, of new Ph.D.'s who, though community college teaching was not in their career plan until recently, might become successful teachers if they can be brought to understand the mission of the community college and to accept and enjoy the role of community college teacher.

2. As mentioned briefly before, the problem of growth may not be troublesome over the next decade. From 50 or 60 new colleges a year, the rate has slowed to perhaps 15 or 20 a year. The Carnegie Commission's estimate is that from 175 to 235 new campuses will be established between 1970 and 1980, or about 18 to 20 a year.

Enrollment increases in existing colleges have settled down from the 20 to 30 percent a year common in the middle and late 1960s to the present 3 to 10 percent. Relief from the pressures of sheer growth will free energy and talent for some or all of the following problems, which, if not properly attended to, will result in bad news--for the community college movement and for the nation.

Four items of bad news, each of which will demand all possible leadership qualities for their satisfactory resolution, are:

1. What happened to excellence? Did you notice as you studied the Carnegie Commission report, The Open Door Colleges, that, although the Commission discussed at great length many major issues confronting community colleges, this very distinguished and all-too-influential group did not address itself at any point to the issue of excellence or quality? The cliché, "meaningful learning," appears often, with frequent emphasis on "meeting the needs of students" and on programs that "meet the needs of society." The report is silent, however, on the need for excellence, quality, standards of attainment, and high levels of performance from faculty, students, and community college graduates. If we look to the 1980 horizon with the Carnegie Commission, we see a road paved with good intentions, and we know where that road leads.

2. What is a "meaningful" junior college education? Junior colleges are already confronted with a syndrome, referred to before, endemic in the youth culture today--a swing away from programs that prepare for careers in a productive economy to programs that are "people-oriented." The antitechnology syndrome is rampant today. It is not limited to junior college students, of course, being even stronger in liberal arts colleges and universities. The current "war against technology," the general youth revolt against production, efficiency, competition, and against economic growth, and the dramatic upswing in enrollments in such fields as sociology, psychology, and the humanities are all a part of the same phenomenon.

Perhaps, some new presidents agree with Ferry's above-cited statement that occupational education in the junior college is a "time-consuming, costly, irrelevant obligation," that the community colleges they are going to lead have "far more important concerns than readying young men and women for the job market." If so, no doubt the conviction is sincere, but they must analyze it critically. In other words, they must examine their premises.

Consider two sets of statistics: (1) Since 1900, the percentage of the total U.S. labor force engaged in professional and managerial occupations has inched up slowly from about 6 percent then to about 16 percent in 1970. (2) In contrast, the curve representing the percentage of college-age youth enrolled in college has escalated steeply from about 4 percent in 1900 to nearly 60 percent in 1970 (78 percent in California). Whether we intend it or not, most students equate "going to college" with entry into a professional or managerial occupation, especially those who major in the arts and sciences, social studies, and the humanities--the "people-oriented" fields.

Last June (1971) thousands of liberal arts graduates with baccalaureate degrees did not find employment, and many are still unemployed as this year's crop of graduates seeks entry into the job market. In my opinion, the softness of the market for college graduates is not merely a transitory phenomenon associated with the current economic slow-down, but a long-term thing that has just now caught us and that will be with us for a long time, because higher education output has exceeded society's demands for liberal arts graduates. There is a limit, even in our affluent, advanced nation, to the number who can be employed in professional and managerial fields, i.e., those that involve "working with people." I would put that limit, perhaps by 1980, at 20 percent of the labor force. If we consciously plan our colleges, their degree programs, their recruitment, admission, and retention policies to produce vastly more college graduates in "people-oriented" fields than this 20 percent, we shall be preparing a blueprint for disaster. To put it bluntly, we already have an oversupply of philosopher-kings. The ear of the educated unemployed is upon us.

In view of the dismal employment prospects for baccalaureate degree graduates from people-oriented fields, it is doubly disturbing to observe the proliferation of associate degree programs in community colleges that can be similarly catagorized. They come under such headings as "environmental studies," "awareness programs," "American studies," "urban studies," or "general studies." In general, they are not preprofessional and their transferability, except into a four-year program with a similar name, remains in doubt. Job opportunities for those with a baccalaureate degree in such fields are extremely limited; for those with only an associate degree, they are virtually nil. These are, by and large, dead-end programs, unless the student combines with his "awareness program" a sequence of courses leading to occupational competence in some middle-manpower field.

Those presidents who have strong theoretical objections to such an "economic bias" for community college education have the problem of somehow reconciling their philosophical position with the hard facts of economic life for the graduates of their college. An education that stresses how to live without equal emphasis on making a living is untenable. It is probably no accident that fasting and the contemplative life are so closely associated.

Society generally recognizes two "goods" in education--an economic good and a consumer good. The former contributes to the nation's productivity and indeed is essential to it, and society generally goes not complain about the cost, for it is really not a cost at all, but an investment. By contrast, even in the halcyon days of the mid-60s, there was plenty of low-voiced complaining about the consumer good costs inherent in community college operations, and I predict markedly increasing public clamor in the 1970s that educational consumer goods should be paid for just like other consumer goods--by the consumer himself.

In summary, I suggest that a truly meaningful junior college educational program (1) prepares selected students of demonstrated academic ability for upper-division studies and an eventual baccalaureate degree, or (2) prepares many (perhaps most) of its students for occupational competence in middle-manpower fields, along with such general studies, awareness studies, and liberal studies as may be desirable for effective citizenship. The desirability of liberal learning and humanistic studies within technical/occupational programs is a thesis that needs no defense--it is accepted by everyone in community college circles except perhaps a few old-time Smith-Hughes vocational educators--but we must insist that, among the several roles of the community junior college, the primary one is the preparation of average youth for his life's work. We cannot allow the junior college to go the way of the American high school--to the point that the associate degree has no worth in economic terms.

3. Translating middle-manpower needs into community college curriculum. "Middle manpower" describes that portion of the occupational spectrum between the professional and managerial occupations on the one hand and the skilled trades on the other. These paraprofessional, semiprofessional, technical, and highly skilled occupations exhibit a balance between cognitive abilities and manipulative abilities, requiring a goodly amount of both. Taken in toto, middle-manpower workers accounted for about 35 percent of the 1970 labor force.

The 1960s saw rapid development of curriculums for the education and training of technicians for industry, science, and engineering. The enrollment growth curves in these fields have now flattened out, but they will still be important on through the '70s, with, I hope, more "clustering" and less specialization in narrow fields, and greater emphasis on cooperative work experience to learn specialized skills on the job. Commissioner Marland's emphasis on career education is beginning to make an impact here.

The present rapid growth in the allied health technologies seems reasonably certain to continue. Again, we need to experiment with clusters and with a core curriculum for health occupations. Ladder curriculums, which will permit lateral and vertical mobility within occupational hierarchies, are just now beginning to show promise of acceptance.

In response to apparent societal needs, there is currently a large number of one- and two-year programs in the public services or "human services." It seems that these programs will attract more students as the decade moves along, but before we engage in the "hard sell" it would be well to remember that:

a. Of all such curriculums, only law enforcement has proved itself over an extended period of time, with scores of successful programs, substantial enrollment, and ready placement for graduates.

b. The teacher aide program, which seemed a "natural" a few years ago, is hardly viable at all today, when fully qualified teachers by the thousands cannot find jobs.

c. Social worker aides, urban planning aides, recreational assistants, and similar "people-oriented" technicians are finding that jobs are scarce. They may be needed, but they are not in demand. The job openings are not yet funded in the budgets of federal, state, and community agencies.

Although the mid-'70s may see a substantial demand for people-oriented semiprofessionals, there is certainly no sign of it now. It is likely that, even when these jobs begin to open up in increasing numbers, they will be filled immediately by the overflow of baccalaureate degree graduates unable to find employment at professional levels. The outlook for associate degree graduates in liberal arts and "awareness" fields will remain grim.

Everyone is concerned about ecology, environmental improvement, and conservation of natural resources these days, and community colleges have responded to perceived needs with a wide variety of new curriculums--environmental studies, air pollution technology, fish and wildlife technology, and similar goal-oriented curriculums. With such tremendous national interest (and political hay) in environmental improvement, as the decade moves along to 1980, there may be hundreds or even thousands of funded positions for two-year college career-program graduates--but the jobs are not there now, and it may be several years before there is a reasonable demand.

As a further point, curriculum development should proceed quite carefully, because no one knows yet just how the whole problem of environmental improvement will be "sliced up" when it comes to applying job analysis technique to the manpower problem. When the systems analysts and the PERT people plan the whole operation, will it be sliced horizontally so that environmental studies people at various degree levels will be needed, so that water problems will require water treatment technicians, and wildlife conservation, fish and game technicians? This assumption, which current curriculum planners are making, could be wrong. Presidents probably should not delegate all this planning to those who are environmental awareness evangelists as they are so concerned about the problem that they do not think very carefully about its solution.

It is entirely possible that the whole field may be sliced vertically, arranged in a matrix that presupposes that the best attack on the total problem of environmental improvement can be made by coordinating and managing well-trained, discipline-oriented workers. Thus, it may turn out that the jobs will be for physicists, chemists, biologists, and engineers; and their semiprofessional co-workers will be technicians trained in the same disciplines, assisted by computer technicians, accountants, and clerical workers to manage the records. We should be alert to this latter possibility and not

get locked in too early to a pattern of curriculum development which, being goal-oriented, may not give the graduate enough depth in any field to allow him to cope with the complexity of the problems he is supposed to solve.

I see no reason to assume that programs in the business field will not continue to enroll more students than any other occupational area. This has been the case in junior colleges for 40 years, and it is unlikely to change over the next ten.

Finally, as for curriculum, despite the economic and manpower shifts that will inevitably come along the road to 1980, it will be a solid core of stability at the center of a maelstrom of change. The work force out on that 1980 horizon will not be frastically different from that of today. The colleges can plan to educate and train nurses, secretaries, welders, engineering technicians, salesmen, accountants, draftsmen, mechanics, repairmen, and lab technicians with a great deal of confidence that they will be employed in good jobs directly related to their training. In general, the more highly specialized a curriculum is (e.g., air pollution technology), the less job mobility the graduate has. By the opposite token, the proper amount of theoretical and general education content in an occupational curriculum enhances occupational mobility. Curriculum planners (and community college presidents) should keep such a guideline in mind and balance it against the "special" needs of their communities.

Further, although there need be no diminution of effort in transfer programs, particularly preprofessional programs, I remind you of my expressed caveats: (1) about excellence and standards of performance, and (2) about "awareness" programs and "general studies" programs, which have no economic utility. The open-door college is a great idea; open-door courses and curriculums are a snare and a delusion.

4. Students and Higher Education--Your Greatest Challenge. America has been engaged for the past 20 years in a quantum jump in education. The "conventional wisdom" has been that if higher education for some is good, higher education for everybody is better. I am being heretical in asking you to examine that premise. I suggest that, if we are to have universal higher education, it must take new directions. We certainly cannot put all youth (or even 60 percent of youth) through college with associate degrees or bachelor's degrees in liberal arts, social sciences, and the humanities (i.e., the people-oriented fields), without courting disaster. Aristotle's oft-quoted dictum that "the proper aim of education is the wise use of leisure" may have described his age and his society, but not ours. Higher education for the present (and the future) must indeed be, for most people, a preparation for life's work, not a means of getting out of work for life.

You and I live as educators in a society that still generally accepts the thesis that education could be a deciding factor in solving many of society's problems, but it is being questioned today by millions of citizens, by legislators and by taxpayers, and is being put to the test on nearly every campus in the nation. Sadly, the results are all too often disillusioning. When college faculty and students openly break the law; demand free speech for themselves and deny it to others; disrupt and destroy, and denigrate those who disagree with them; give encouragement to the enemy of freedom while

protected by the very freedom they revile--when these things happen on your campus (they happen almost daily on mine), does it make you wonder where we made the wrong turn? And if so, how do you plan to get back on the road? How do you, as new presidents, intend to make the community college count for the future of America as a free and responsible society? Will your community look on your college as a solution to, or as a part of, the problem? Have we been looking ahead to 1980, or is the horizon we see labeled 1984? The most important business of community college education is the development of individual freedom, dignity, responsibility, and productivity. We have all too often, recently, downgraded individualism as we have engaged in the rhetoric of "societal needs." Unknowingly perhaps, by negating the importance of individual dignity and responsibility, we are pulling the rug out from under democracy itself.

A decade ago, Adlai Stevenson said it much more eloquently than I can, in an address titled, "Man as an End in Himself":

> Whether democracy can prevail in the great upheaval of our time is a valid question. We have good reason to know how relatively clumsy, slow, inefficient, and costly it is compared to the certainty, celerity, and secrecy of absolutism.
>
> ...The enemies of freedom, whatever the magnificent ends they propose, whether they propose brotherhood of man, the kingdom of the saints, "from each according to his ability; to each according to his needs" ... all miss just this essential point: that man is greater than the purposes to which he can be put. He must not be kicked about even with the most high-minded of objectives. He is not a means or an instrument. He is an end in himself.
>
> This is the essence of what we mean by democracy ... an irrevocable and final dedication to the dignity of man.*

---

* Time, February 1, 1963.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

James L. Wattenbarger

Being president of a community college is probably the most interesting and challenging job in the whole field of higher education. It will make the greatest contribution and undoubtedly receive the greatest support from the public over the next 20 years. Despite the complaints that the community college president is mistreated by university decision-making, the university is in no position to do this and most universities know it. Those that do not will find out fast, for legislatures are continually cutting back on funds available for universities while increasing those for the community colleges. The reason is that the community colleges are doing educationally what they say they can do. The universities have lived too high for too long to achieve the same kind of general acceptance. The most important job in the junior college is developing attitudes. The whole idea of making an educational institution available to people, if you are going to receive financial support, involves a great deal of planning.

These are the types of student the community college serves:

1. Youth who are preparing to transfer to a baccalaureate program. This the colleges are doing without any difficulty.

2. Youth who have no identified purpose, probably the largest group. For many years the community college was an alternative to the young men who might be drafted, and it served young ladies with varied programs far better than many universities.

3. Youth who are preparing for definite occupations and careers in the fields of engineering and health science technology.

4. Youth who are learning a job skill such as auto mechanics.

5. Youth and adults who work part time or full time and require Saturday classes, evening classes, or 1:00 a.m. classes.

6. Youth with unusual abilities who enroll while still of high school age.

7. Adults who are returning to college. There are no more drop-outs. They are usually stop-outs.

8. Adults who require mid-career training.

9. Adults who are changing their occupation.

10. Adults who now have their first opportunity for college.

11. Adults who need re-emphasis upon the quality of living, which requires an improved educational program, such as a college for the retired. Colleges are bringing classes to recreation centers at a time that is convenient for the people who live there.

Higher education is for everyone beyond high school age. An institution like this will receive public support because it is making a contribution to education in the lives of the people.

Professional groups turn to the community colleges for certain services. For example, when dental supply firms set up laboratories in the dental hygiene programs displaying the latest equipment, dentists attend seminars to examine the equipment and learn how to use it. They are not interested in credit--just the service.

Many junior colleges started out with only local support from interested citizens or industrial firms. Students paid fees to learn a job skill, and teachers taught for practically nothing, but in the early 1960s some basic principles were developed:

1. Coordination is a basic state responsibility, better expressed through a leadership role than through a directive role. Coordination should encourage the distinctiveness of institutions and not stifle creativity.

2. With an assignment of responsibility must also be authority to act. Interference from other agencies, at the present time, is among our most difficult problems. If a state agency is given responsibility for education, it should also be given authority to act by the legislature and finance department.

3. Since standardization does not equal quality or fairness, everyone should not be put into the same mold. The job of the state agency is to set floors, not ceilings. Financing of programs needs to be evaluated. It is unfair to allocate money on the basis of credit hours offered or the number of students enrolled. As different curriculums cost different amounts, a new formula needs to be designed. The size of an institution has much to do with the cost per student.

4. Methods of achieving coordination are as important as the principal of it, including the approach to and implementation of a solution.

5. There should be unitary responsibility to the state level agency. The greatest violation of this principle is in the occupational programs, where money from the federal government for funding vocational programs comes through state boards instead of going directly to the colleges. State boards set up their own allocation criteria for funds, some based on largesse, personal friendships, influence, or a formula basis of FTE. Costs for occupational programs range from 0.89 to 3.76 in ratio costs.

At present, there are 50 state systems of higher education, but in the late '70s and '80s, there will be regional systems requiring cooperation among the states.

The four major roles of the state-level agency show the range of responsibility for community colleges, whether it is a controlling or a coordinating agency:

1. Leadership--how the agency speaks to the legislature

2. Administration--how it administers laws or certain programs (such as financial programs) or meets legal requirements

3. Enforcement--seeing that the laws are followed in finance and at other levels of operation (may also include certain levels of courses)

4. Coordination--developing relationships between and among institutions for particular programs.

TYPES OF STATE LEVEL COMMUNITY COLLEGE BOARDS
GOVERNING AND COORDINATING RESPONSIBILITY

1. Community College Board Governs and Coordinates (11 states). Examples:

   Arizona - *Colorado - Massachusetts - *Virginia - *Washington

2. Colleges Governed and Coordinated by a University System.

   Alaska - *Kentucky - Nevada - New York

3. Colleges Governed and Coordinated by a State Board of Education.

   *Alabama - Oregon

TYPES OF STATE LEVEL COMMUNITY COLLEGE BOARDS
GOVERNING RESPONSIBILITY

1. Community College Board Directly Controls and Operates Institutions (9 states). Examples:

   *Connecticut - Delaware - *Minnesota

2. Colleges Controlled by University System.

   Hawaii - *Utah

3. Colleges Belong to University System--President Makes Decisions

   Georgia - West Virginia

4. Colleges Governed by State Board of Education.

   *Louisiana - *Tennessee

---

*Also Super Board

TYPES OF STATE LEVEL COMMUNITY COLLEGE BOARDS COORDINATING RESPONSIBILITY

1. Community College State Board and Coordinating Council of Higher Education or Commission on Higher Education.

   California - Illinois - Maryland - Mississippi - Wyoming

2. Colleges Controlled by University System.

   Arkansas - New Jersey - New Mexico - Ohio - Oklahoma - South Carolina - Texas

3. Colleges Controlled by State Boards of Education.

   *Florida - *Idaho - Iowa - *Kansas - *Michigan - *Missouri - Montana - North Carolina - Pennsylvania - Rhode Island - Wisconsin

State boards will definitely and ultimately become the governing and coordinating agencies. We must therefore be concerned with how to preserve essential areas of autonomy for the institution and with how a state agency can work in a more effective and efficient way.

Florida has moved toward more state control and entire state support. Virginia started with state support and control, but is now delegating authority to local levels. There is now greater expertise in the individual colleges than among the central staff.

Procedures:

1. Have a small state level staff. As you cannot have all expertise in one place, use a college ad hoc task force.

2. Establish a single line of responsibility and reporting. Interference comes from building agencies and vocational program agencies, when these responsibilities really belong to community colleges.

3. Develop and use a clearly defined management information system with data banks for budget, students, faculty, programs (a common course numbering system), and facilities. WICHE is working on this for university needs.

4. Involve everyone in development of policy. Establish councils for presidents, curriculum and academic affairs, business, and student personnel services, and let the colleges coordinate them.

5. Simplify approval procedures and programs.

---

*Also Super Boards

6. See that the state board acts as liaison between junior colleges and other state agencies.

7. Work for clear and equitable financial support.

8. Make sure that roles are assigned and adhered to.

9. Prevent university and junior college fields from overlapping.

PARTICIPANTS
SUMMER WORKSHOP
FOR
NEW COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS AND THEIR WIVES
JULY 9-14, 1972
UCLA

Dr. Joseph K. Bailey (Phyllis)
Community College of Denver
Red Rocks Campus
1209 Quail Street
Lakewood, Colorado 80215

Dr. Orville D. Carnahan (Colleen)
Highline Community College
Midway, Washington 98031

Dr. E. Stanley Chace (Esther)
Medicine Hat College
Medicine Hat, Alberta, Canada

Dr. John E. Cleek (Bernadine)
South Oklahoma City Junior College
2700 South May
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73108

Dr. Thomas E. Deem (Mary Ann)
Yakima Valley College
Yakima, Washington 98902

Dr. John W. Hakanson (Helen)
Clackamas Community College
19600 South Molalla Avenue
Oregon City, Oregon 97045

Dr. James Harvey (Jackie)
Prince George's Community College
Largo, Maryland

Dr. John B. Hirt (Alice)
Community College System of Allegheny County
711 Allegheny Building
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219

Mr. Ashley Johnson (Lillian)
Prairie State College
Chicago Heights, Illinois 60411

Dr. Thomas M. Law (Katherine)
Penn Valley Community College
Kansas City, Missouri 64111

Dr. Harold J. McGee (Mary)
Piedmont Virginia Community College
P.O. Box 5183
Charlottesville, Virginia 22903

Dr. Roy G. Mikalson (Eva)
Santa Rosa Junior College
Santa Rosa, California 95401

Dr. Ralph M. Miwa (Hilda)
Leeward Community College
96-050 Farrington Highway
Honolulu, Hawaii

Dr. William F. Murison (Eve)
Selkirk College
Box 1200
Castlegar, British Columbia, Canada

Dr. Omar L. Olson (Peg)
Lorain County Community College
1005 North Abbe Road
Elyria, Ohio 44035

Dr. Kenneth W. Oosting (Jacklyn)
Harford Community College
Bel Air, Maryland 21014

Dr. Jess H. Parrish (Norma)
Shelby State Community College
Memphis, Tennessee

Dr. Craven H. Sumerell (Carol)
Piedmont Technical Institute
Roxboro, North Carolina 27573

Dr. Fred A. Taylor (Mozelle)
College of the Mainland
Texas City, Texas 77590

Dr. George B. Vaughan (Peggy)
Mountain Empire Community College
Big Stone Gap, Virginia 24219

Dr. Donald Weichert (Lynn)
College of the Redwoods
Eureka, California 95501

Dr. Reginald Wilson (Dolores)
Wayne County Community College
4612 Woodward Avenue
Detroit, Michigan 48201